

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

February 1, 2013

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; lgoldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of January 7, 2013 BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** The Design Review Board's Chair, John Kriken, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:35 p.m. Other Design Review Board members in attendance included Karen Alschuler, Cheryl Barton, Roger Leventhal and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Brad McCrea, Bob Batha, Erik Buehmann, Ellie Knecht and Ellen Miramontes. Waterfront Design Advisory Committee members in attendance included Boris Dramov, Dan Hodapp and Kathrin Moore.

2. **Approval of Draft Minutes for December 10, 2012 Meeting.** The Board approved these minutes with no corrections.

3. **Crane Cove Park, Port of San Francisco Pier 70, City and County of San Francisco (First Pre-Application Review)** The Board and the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Design Advisory Committee jointly conducted their first pre-application review of a proposal by the Port of San Francisco to construct an approximately eight-acre public park at Pier 70. The proposal includes the construction of a multi-use park within the footprint of an area used for historic shipbuilding and repair operations. Within the Commission's Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction, the public activities would include open lawn areas, gardens, seating and picnic areas, playgrounds, facilities serving human-powered boats, and public art.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Erik Buehmann introduced the project and the issues identified in the staff report.

b. **Project Presentation.** David Beaupré, with the Port of San Francisco, introduced the project by providing a project overview and describing the property and neighborhood context, adjacent uses, the community process to date, and the project schedule. He noted that the Pier 70 Master Plan aims to balance continuing ship repair uses, new development, historic preservation and public open space. He emphasized that the historic importance of the site and its remaining historic resources have driven much of the planning process and that efforts are underway to designate the area as an historic district.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

DRB MINUTES
January 7, 2013

Alma DuSolier, with AECOM, then described the project's aspirations, which include the following: historic preservation, program and activities, access and views, integration with new development, and sustainability. She outlined the community's desires for the site, earlier design alternatives that have led to the current plan, and walked the Board and Committee through the five main park zones that are proposed.

Patricia Fonseca, with AECOM, described the design and uses of the five zones in further detail. David Beaupré concluded the project presentation by noting that the current park design is estimated to cost approximately 44 million dollars and that 20 million of this would be funded by 2008 and 2012 City park bonds.

c. **Reviewer Questions.** The Board and Committee members asked the following questions:

(1) Mr. Hodapp asked whether the concrete blocks shown within Slipway 4 would be moveable. It was confirmed that they would be moveable with the use of machinery.

(2) Ms. Moore stated that their Committee had received some simple diagrams without great explanation and so while she felt it was a good presentation, it is a large project to understand and she did not have any immediate comments.

(3) Mr. Kriken commented that it appeared to be an attractive park design that would draw much use, although he expressed concern regarding public safety on a 24-hour basis given that many of the park's edges would not have much public activity going on around the clock. Mr. Beaupré stated that they anticipate the development of 1,000 new residential units within ¼ mile while also acknowledging that public safety concerns would need to be addressed in the design and management of the park.

(4) Mr. Strang inquired whether the historic cranes were still moveable and also whether their proposed locations would coincide with previous historic locations. Ms. DuSolier explained that the crane wheels had been filled over time so they were no longer moveable, although once moved, they would rest within the alignment where they moved historically.

(5) Mr. Leventhal and Ms. Alschuler were both curious where the current Bay Trail alignment is and how this might change. Mr. Beaupré indicated the current alignment and noted that this alignment would likely change upon development of the park.

(6) Mr. Leventhal questioned how stormwater would be handled, and noted that infiltration would not be desirable given the likely contaminated nature of runoff in the area. Ms. DuSolier explained that they were studying this aspect of the project in more detail and would pursue detention of stormwater rather than infiltration in order that the contaminants would attach to soil rather than water.

(7) Ms. Barton questioned how the sediment beneath the water near the launching areas would be treated. Mr. Beaupré stated that they were investigating the nature of the sediment further and may determine that sediment cleanup work is required. He further noted that the entire shoreline edge would have some form of a cap to prevent migration of contaminants into the Bay.

(8) Ms. Alschuler asked whether the Port had considered moving the small boat repair yard (Boatworks) located north of the site. Mr. Beaupré responded that the Port had explored this but determined that it made sense to keep this small boat repair in place due to the need for such facilities along the waterfront and also economic concerns of relocating the yard and constructing a new facility. In addition, he indicated that the current design would not preclude moving the boatyard in the future should it become feasible.

(9) Ms. Alschuler asked whether there would be any Bay fill involved with the project. Mr. Beaupré stated that it was possible some fill would occur in the beach area although the amount of fill removal and fill placement would likely be balanced.

d. **Public Comment.** The following public comments were made:

(1) Paul Nixon, a founding member of Bay Access and longtime Dolphin Club member, responded to the fourth issue raised in BCDC's staff report regarding potential navigational safety concerns. He stated that industrial uses and recreational swimming and boating have always mixed together along the San Francisco waterfront and he believes these uses would be able to work together safely here. He suggested that to begin with, two storage containers filled with boats could be placed in Slipway 4 and the boating community could begin to use the area and determine what safety measures and practices should be implemented.

(2) Kent Peterson, an environmental manager from the adjacent shipyards, stated that they would be dedicated to working closely with the U.S. Coast Guard to determine the best practices to ensure safety between the interaction of ship repair operations and recreational boaters.

(3) Gail Brownell, a member of the South End Rowing Club, stated that she is very excited about the project and would like to see many ways to get in and out of the water provided throughout the project site.

(4) Bo Barnes, a Bay Access Board member, stated that this is a great project. He further commented that this area of the shoreline is quite unique in that it does not have any mud and also is very protected from the southern storms. He said that the people who would store boats here would be very active in maintaining safety for the water uses.

(5) Larry Beer shared that he had been paddling in Mission Bay since the late 1970's and noted that Mission Rock used to rent rowboats in the 1960's. He relayed that he had never heard of any major conflicts between small boaters and the shipyard and that they had successfully co-existed for decades.

(6) Ralph Wilson, a Potrero Booster and amateur historian, shared that he has created an historical record of the site, which can be found at pier70sf.org. He noted that the historical integrity of the site has been well respected and that Slipway 4 should be remembered as the heart of the area since many important ships have launched from there over time. He also shared that the public process has been very good and the Port has been quite responsive.

(7) Jill Fox, an India Basin resident and member of the Blue Greenway Task Force, stated that generally the Port has done a good job although she is concerned about the "orange blocks" on the plan for which the development types and heights have not been determined. She noted that depending on the proposed heights, it might be likely that the proposed beach area would often be shaded. She also expressed the importance of providing for adequate path widths to accommodate bicyclists along with pedestrians throughout the site.

(8) Toby Levine, a co-chair for the Port's Central Waterfront Advisory Group shared that they meet on a regular basis and go into great detail regarding the project plans. She stated that their next meeting would be on January 16th at the Chronicle Building at 5:30 pm.

(9) Howard Wong, an architect and member of the Central Waterfront Advisory Group, noted that this area is a unique part of San Francisco and for a long time had served as an industrial center for the western United States. He further commented that the Pier 70 Master Plan and Crane Cove Park Plan had been through a very intensive public process and that this prior process should be carefully considered and taken into account.

(10) Robert Mullet, a property owner nearby on 3rd Street, stated that this was his first review the proposed plan. He noted that it is an intricate plan that requires very careful review, as many people will be affected by this conceptual plan. He stated that it should be considered how residential use would affect the park physically and economically. He reiterated Board Member concerns about management of stormwater runoff.

e. Board Discussion

(1) Ms. Moore stated that there should be some clear response regarding the future development sites so that there is a common understanding of how it would activate and interact with the park. She also noted that ABAG should be involved with the discussion of where the Bay Trail alignment might best be located.

(2) Mr. Leventhal stated that there should be more detailed cross sections developed depicting appropriate slopes for gaining access to the water as one would not be able to walk up what appear to be 2:1 riprap slopes shown in the renderings. He also said it would be helpful to understand the phasing of the project. He further noted that it is very important to consider sea level rise and determine whether some areas would be allowed to flood.

(3) Ms. Alschuler stated that it is very important to consider the flow and connections of movement along the shoreline. The design should provide a clear continuity for finding your way along the shore and she would like to see the Bay Trail alignment move closer to the shoreline edge. She commented that it is wonderful to save all of Slipway 4 and she believes the visual connections toward the park will be exciting. Although she believes that one thing missing is “the chance to get up high and look down” at the park and an opportunity for this should be explored. She was pleased to hear that there was no conflict between the recreational boaters and the shipyard. She also asked when the project might return to the Board to which Mr. Beaupré responded it would return just prior to developing schematics.

(4) Mr. Kriken expressed concern regarding how the shoreline will be addressed. He likes the presence of old places such as Boatworks and The Ramp, which he believes add to the atmosphere. He believes that when areas become homogenously new all at once that this richness can be lost. He also commented, that not all shoreline parks need to have large propellers on display.

(5) Ms. Alschuler commented that the Maritime Fields Zone (Zone 4) did not “sing” for her. She wondered what this large open area would be used for and encouraged for the design to provide flexibility, allowing the use and potentially improvements to be determined in a later phase based upon how the space and its users evolve.

(6) Ms. Barton stated that the Open Green and Gardens Zone (Zone 1) should not be overly manicured as a park area.

(7) Mr. Dramov commented that it had been a great presentation and investigation. He thought it could be interesting to purposely allow for sea level rise to occur within the design so that one would be able to perceive high water marks over time. He observed that a “20-40 million dollar park does not come along often” and, as a result, it is very important that this be a memorable place. He remarked that while the current park design was formed with many smaller elements establishing the concept, he would like to see an idea that would tie all of these separate pieces together. He noted that the juxtaposition of the park with the shipyard heightens ones awareness of the working waterfront.

(8) Mr. Hodapp noted it had been a great presentation and he was pleased to hear the strong community voices. He commented that he would like to see a clear way to travel along the edge of the shoreline. He would also like to understand more clearly how one would

access the water from the boat storage facility. He further stated that there are “two big prizes at the site which include the shipyard next door and Slipway 4,” which the design does well to preserve although he fears that the prominence of Slipway 4 may be getting lost due to what is occurring on either side of it.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Beaupré stated that it is important that all parts of the project work together and that there is a need for development to balance the open space elements within the plan. They have been focusing on the park design, although they will need to pursue all parts of the plan, including the adjacent development sites, in order to create a successful result.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board concluded its review with the following comments:

(1) **There should be a common understanding of what the future development sites might contain including proposed uses and heights.**

(2) **Sea level rise should be carefully considered and with this exploration, more detailed cross sections provided. Once people become connected to a public space they often want to protect it and may not be willing to allow rising sea levels to inundate the shoreline as a part of the intended design. The proposal to allow for sea level rise should be explicitly thought through.**

(3) **More information on the project phasing should be provided.**

(4) **Public safety should be carefully considered.**

(5) **Treatment of the Bay edge should be further refined.**

(6) **A clear and continuous path closer to the shoreline edge should be provided.**

(7) **The industrial feeling of the site should be maintained.**

(8) **Stormwater treatment should be carefully considered.**

(9) **An opportunity to be elevated in order to provide views down should be explored.**

(10) **The uses and design of Zone 4 (the Maritime Fields) should be reconsidered.**

(11) **Explore design concepts, which would pull the whole design together.**

(12) **Provide more information on the proposed boating facilities and how they will function.**

(13) **The project will return for another review prior to schematics.**

4. **Pete’s Harbor Residential Community, City of Redwood City, San Mateo County (Second DRB Pre-Application Review).** BCDC’s Design Review Board conducted a second review of a proposal to construct a residential development, including eleven residential buildings, a clubhouse, a parking garage, and parking spaces, and create new waterfront public access across an approximately 70,666-square-foot area, at an approximately 13.25-acre site, located at One Uccelli Boulevard, in the City of Redwood City, San Mateo County. The proposal includes installation of a San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail site. The public access activities proposed within the Commission’s 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction would include construction of a 1,260-foot-long public access trail with public access landscaping, a playground, bocce ball court, gazebo, seating areas, bike racks, and overlooks. The proposed buildings and the majority of the development would occur outside of the Commission’s jurisdiction.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Erik Buehmann introduced the project and the issues identified in the staff report. He also noted that he had received a call from BCDC Commissioner Pine who inquired about the impacts of future sea level rise on the site and also whether the proposed seven parking spaces would be sufficient for the Water Trail access point and other public access amenities envisioned.

b. **Project Presentation.** Joe Wilson with The Pauls Corporation provided a brief overview of the project noting the project location, the current property use, connectivity to existing trails and the proposed public access areas. Brian Fletcher with Callander Associates then provided a presentation responding to all of the Board's comments from their previous review. Matt Grueber with Callander Associates also contributed to the presentation.

(1) **Parking spaces and view corridors.** The three parking spaces at the northern end of the eastern view corridor were removed and relocated. Some trees have also been removed in order to avoid obstructing the view corridors and the palms were moved closer to the buildings.

(2) **Definition between public access and residential areas.** In order to clearly communicate a division between the public access and residential spaces, planting and pavement materials in the public access areas would differ from those used in the residential portions of the property. The planting palette and paving would be generally uniform throughout the public access area. The pavement in the public access areas would be a warm gray color while the paving in the residential areas would be tan.

(3) **Clear and direct shoreline route.** The public access pathways were modified to clearly distinguish the multi-purpose bicycle pathway from the more pedestrian-oriented areas. Furthermore, the route has been modified to offer a smooth and direct alignment around the public access amenities such as the playground, bocce court, and seating areas.

(4) **Water Trail.** Public access parking and a staging area would be located close to the Water Trail site. A new accessible ramp would lead to the dock where an accessible transfer system would be provided. The applicants proposed removing all boat slips at the western side of the Marina, except for the water trail access point.

(5) **Circular seating areas.** The northwestern overlook has been modified from its original circular appearance. The northeastern overlook point has remained circular to fit the natural curvature of the point and to emphasize panoramic views.

(6) **Main entry.** The main entry to the public access area has been straightened to provide a more direct and obvious path along the shoreline.

(7) **Direct physical access to the water.** The applicants stated that providing direct access to the water would be challenging due to issues with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and also sea level rise. In addition, the adaptive management plan would conflict with providing a beach, which would erode over time.

(8) **Plant palette.** The plant palette in the public access areas has been revised to better reflect the Bay environment, by relying on the plant list provided in BCDC's *Shoreline Plants – A Landscape Guide for the San Francisco Bay* and also following the *Bay Friendly* plant list recommendations. The palms and other trees that were located in the public access area have been moved closer to the residential areas of the property.

c. **Reviewer Questions.** The Board members asked the following questions:

(1) Ms. Barton asked whether the float would be available to all types of users to which Mr. Fletcher answered yes.

(2) Mr. Leventhal inquired about what sea level projections were applied in order to develop the proposed adaptive management strategies. Mr. Grueber stated they had assumed a 16-inch rise by 2050 and a 55-inch rise by 2100. He explained that the entire site was proposed to be elevated by three feet. Mr. Leventhal also asked whether dredging is required for the marina area to which Mr. Grueber responded no.

d. **Public Comment.** The following public comments were made:

(1) Sabrina Brennan, a San Mateo Harbor Commissioner, stated her support for Commissioner Pine's comments. She asked whether additional riprap would be added to which Mr. Fletcher responded they may add a limited amount of riprap. She also expressed concern about storms overtopping the proposed Bay Trail and feels that the setback should be at least 100 feet. She questioned the appropriateness of residential use at this location and mentioned that public access concerns regarding sea level rise would need to be addressed. She liked the Water Trail improvements, public access parking and the public's ability to access the docks in order to enjoy looking at the boats. She was concerned that shadows from the three-story buildings would shade the public access area at the northeastern point. She stated that the public access area appeared too confined and believed that it may not feel comfortable for the public to use. She noted that the restaurant has been a popular spot over the years and lamented that the plan does not provide for any indoor form of public access from which people could enjoy Bay views.

(2) Paul Suplait, who has lived at Pete's Harbor for 12 years, supports Paula Uccelli's right to sell and The Pauls Corporation right to develop. Although he is concerned with the proposed transfer of the State Lands Commission lease since he understands that the developers have no interest in operating a public commercial marina and, as such, he believes that access to the public trust will no longer be available. After 60 years of access being allowed, no liveaboards or outside boat owners would be allowed and this change he believes would be at the expense of the public trust. He asks that the Commission (BCDC) address the public trust issue at hand.

(3) Mr. McCrea, Director of BCDC's Regulatory Program, provided a clarification in response Ms. Brennan's earlier comments. He explained that the 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction as defined under the Commission's law is not an explicit "setback" distance. He further explained that the only reason that the Commission may deny a permit in the shoreline band is if it fails to provide maximum feasible public access.

(4) Shaun (unknown last name) does not live at Pete's Harbor although is very familiar with it. She stated that Pete's Harbor is "a community that matters and now feels very open to the public and you do not feel like you are sneaking around someone's front yard." She believes that the proposed buildings, which are "very tall and close to the shoreline," will change this feeling greatly and the "Bay Trail will be a one-way road to nowhere." Also, there is "great indoor access" now at the restaurant. She also commented that there is intermittent flooding that occurs in the area already and that future sea level rise is likely to be a serious problem. She concluded by stating that, "Pete's Harbor is a community worth fighting for."

(5) Brenda Hattery, a current resident at Pete's Harbor, stated that she appreciated the opportunity to share photos at the last DRB meeting. She noted that she likes the opportunity provided for non-motorized boats and the improvements that will accommodate persons with disabilities at the Water Trail site. She had hoped that the boating would be more integrated with the development.

e. **Board Discussion**

(1) Mr. Kriken stated that the applicants had generally accomplished what the Board had previously asked them to do.

(2) Mr. Strang commented that the entry to the project could be further improved to diminish the vehicular dominance and provide an even more intuitive entry for pedestrians and bicyclists. Mr. Fletcher responded that they could alter the design in this area by softening the vehicular radius. Mr. Strang also mentioned that the parking in the middle view corridor could be flipped in order to improve the open view. Although it was explained, that this could not be accomplished due the location of the garage entries.

(3) Mr. Leventhal observed that he did not recognize the datum used on the drawings. It was explained that a local datum had been used. He directed the applicant to use NAVD and then add the new FEMA sea level rise projections. He also stated that there should be a written description of how the project will respond to sea level rise and within that the applicant should lay out their assumptions.

(4) Ms. Alschuler likes the greater division between the public and privates spaces and can better envision the more natural planting choices.

(5) Mr. Strang appreciates the changes to the plant palette but believes that this could be pushed even further. Ms. Barton also agreed with this suggestion.

f. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** The Board determined that the applicants had responded to all of their previous comments and the project would not need to return to the Board for further review.

5. **Adjournment.** Mr. Kriken adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLEN MIRAMONTES
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with corrections, at the
Design Review Board Meeting of February 11, 2013.